



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/733,286	12/08/00	JAMES A	60366

000109 IM22/1016  
THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION  
P. O. BOX 1967  
MIDLAND MI 48641-1967

EXAMINER  
SERGENT, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1711	

DATE MAILED: 10/16/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/733,286

Applicant(s)  
James et al.

Examiner  
Rabon Sergeant

Art Unit  
1711



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 3, 6
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1711

1. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what quantity of blisters or fatty-acid ester can be present and still satisfies the “substantially free” and “substantially fewer” language. Also, it is unclear what constitutes an e-coat process.

2. Claims 2, 21, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear how a polyurea is produced when the isocyanate-reactive material is a polyol. To define a polyurethane as a polyurea is repugnant to the art-recognized definition.

3. Claims 10-12, 14, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It should be clarified that the recited temperatures and times refer to the exposure proviso of the claims rather than the actual method of producing the polyurea.

4. Claims 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1711

It is unclear if the claim language is to allow for adding the fatty-acid ester to a preformed or existing polyurea polymer.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-18, and 20-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 96/22182 or Uchida et al. ('670 or '788).

Art Unit: 1711

Each reference discloses reaction injection molded polyureas which contain fatty acid esters in the instantly claimed amounts. See entire documents and, especially, examples of WO 96/22182. WO 96/22182 further discloses the specific use of jojoba oil. Since the references disclose compositions which are derived from components and amounts which meet the claims, the position is taken that one would logically expect the compositions to inherently meet the anti-blistering characteristics of the instant compositions.

7. Claims 3, 19, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 96/22182 or Uchida et al. ('670 or '788), each further in view of Barron et al. ('681).

As aforementioned within paragraph 6, the primary references disclose polyurea compositions containing fatty acid esters in amounts which applicants claim.

8. While the primary references fail to disclose the addition of a polyepoxide to the polyureas, the addition of polyepoxide to polyurea compositions, suitable for use in RIM methods, was known at the time of invention as an effective means for decreasing the formation of blisters resulting from exposure to moisture and elevated temperatures. This position is supported by the teachings of Barron et al.

9. Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate polyepoxide into the compositions of the primary references for the art recognized function of decreasing blistering within polyureas.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sargent at telephone number (703) 308-2982.

  
**RABON SERGENT**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**